

**REMARKS**

By this Amendment, claims 5, 6, 12, 13 and 17 are canceled. Claims 1, 7-11 and 14-16 are amended. Claims 2-4 remain as originally filed. As a result, claims 1-4, 7-11 and 14-16 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is amended to include the same combination of patentable limitations as claim 7, which was indicated as allowable in the above-referenced Office Action. Allowable claim 7 is rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Claim 8 was likewise indicated as allowable in the Office Action subject to correction of a rejection for indefiniteness and is rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Claims 9-11 are amended to change the dependency from canceled claim 6 to patentable claim 7 and to provide further clarity. Claims 14-16 are likewise amended to change the dependency from canceled claim 13 to patentable claim 8 and to provide further clarity.

**Claim Rejection – 35 USC §112**

Pursuant to paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out the subject matter of the invention. Applicants have amended claim 8 to change line 7 from “the ~~first~~ and second inductors ...” to “the third and ~~second~~ fourth inductors ....” so that the amended claim 8 correctly recites “the third and fourth inductors ...” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102**

Pursuant to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 and 9-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,848,150 (Bingel). With regard to independent claims 1, 6 and 13, the Examiner asserts that Bingel teaches in Figure 6 a frequency sensitive electrical circuit comprising first and second inputs 21a-b; at least one

transformer circuit L2 and L4 having a first winding connected to the first input and a second winding connected to the second input; a first load C3, R3 connected in parallel to the first winding L2; a second load C4, R4 connected in parallel to the second winding L4; first and second outputs 23a-b connected to the first and second windings; and a capacitor C5 connected between the first and second outputs. See Office Action at pages 2-3.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection with respect to independent claims 1, 7 and 8. Claim 1 has been amended to include the same combination of patentable limitations as allowable claim 7 with the differences between the claims being merely linguistic. In particular, the "first and second inputs" and "first and second outputs" recited in claim 1 correspond to "the first and second inputs of the first stage" and the "first and second outputs of the first stage" recited in claim 7, respectively. Similarly, the "third and fourth inputs" and the "third and fourth outputs" recited in claim 1 correspond to "the first and second inputs of the second stage" and the "first and second outputs of the second stage" recited in claim 7, respectively. The "first winding" and "first load" and the "second winding" and "second load" recited in claim 1 correspond to the "parallel-connected first inductor and first resistor" and the "parallel-connected second inductor and second resistor" recited in claim 7, respectively. Likewise, the "third winding" and "fourth winding" recited in claim 1 correspond to the "third inductor" and "fourth inductor" recited in claim 7, respectively. Therefore, claim 1 as amended herein is *structurally* equivalent to allowable claim 7 since both claims describe a circuit represented by nodes EFGH (first stage) and nodes CDEF (second stage) shown in FIGS. 3 and 4 of the application. Thus, claim 1 is patentable. Claims 2-4 depend directly from patentable base claim 1, and thus, are likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Claim 7 is rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, claim 7 is patentable. Claim 8 is amended to overcome the indefiniteness rejection and is rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, claim 8 is patentable. Claims 9-11 have been amended to depend directly from patentable base claim 7, and thus, are likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 14-16 have been amended to depend directly from patentable base claim 8, and thus, are likewise allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 5, 6, 12, 13 and 17 are canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully

request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-6 and 9-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Pursuant to paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claim 7 and claim 8 (subject to the indefiniteness rejection) stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 7 and 8 have been rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner, and thus, are patentable.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims 1-4, 7-11 and 14-16 are patentable and request the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowability of the pending claims.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and these remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections to the claims and to reconsider the application. This Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action and places the application in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowability for the pending claims. Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned directly to further the prosecution of any remaining issues, and thereby expedite allowance of the application.

This Amendment does not result in any more independent or total claims than paid for previously. Accordingly, no fee for excess claims is believed to be due. The Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any other fee due in connection with the filing of this response, including any excess claims fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-2167. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not already accounted for, such an extension is requested and the fee should likewise be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2167. Any overpayment should be credited to Deposit Account No. 19-2167.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher C. Dremann  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 36,504  
P. O. Box 489  
Hickory, N. C. 28603  
Telephone: 828/901-5904  
Facsimile: 828/901-5206

**Dated: December 1, 2004**